

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 26, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 13-16 and 18-20 are allowed. Claims 1-12 are rejected and claims 6 and 7 are objected to by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1 and 7 have been amended and claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 21 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-16 and 18-20 remain pending in this application

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,873,311 to Yoshihara et al. (hereinafter "Yoshihara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,882 to Takabayashi (hereinafter "Takabayashi"). The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claims. The disclosure is objected to by the Examiner as containing informalities. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to by the Examiner as containing informalities.

The rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara in view Takabayashi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that as claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection to claim 6 is moot. Applicants submit that Yoshihara and Takabayashi, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of claims 1-5 and 7-12.

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 each recites a field sequential liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "a signal processing circuit connected to an output of the data input driver and to the light sources" and "wherein said signal processing circuit is to receive image data, to determine an average luminance in the image data, and to electrically control the luminance of each of the light sources based on the determined average luminance."

In rejecting claims 1-5 and 7-12, the Examiner cites Yoshihara as teaching a field sequential liquid crystal display, but correctly acknowledges that Yoshihara does not teach a signal processing unit that "directly controls a luminance level of each of the light sources based upon input data from the data input driver."

To cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Yoshihara, the Examiner cites Takabayashi. Applicants submit that Takabayashi does not teach or suggest at least “wherein said signal processing circuit is to receive image data, to determine an average luminance in the image data, and to electrically control the luminance of each of the light sources based on the determined average luminance” as recited in claims 1-5 and 7-12. Applicants note that the Examiner in rejecting claims 1-12 in paragraph 6 of the Office Action makes no allegation that Takabayashi teaches either “to determine an average luminance in the image data” or “to electrically control the luminance of each of the light sources based on the determined average luminance.” Applicants submit that Yoshihara and Takabayashi, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach at least the above-quoted combination of elements. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-5 and 7-12 are allowable over Yoshihara and Takabayashi.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claims. The Examiner objects to the drawings because “a luminance level of each of the light sources” is recited in claim 1, but is not shown in the drawings. Applicants submit that luminance is a quantitative measure of the intensity of light per unit area of a source, and that every quantitative entity inherently has a level. Accordingly, Applicants submit that at least the text “deciding a luminance of a light source” in the fourth block of the flowchart in FIG. 8, clearly illustrates determining a “luminance level of a light source.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that “a luminance level of each of the light sources” is shown at least in FIG. 8 of the drawings.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings fully comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for at least the reasons given above, and respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The disclosure is objected to by the Examiner for informalities. The specification has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 7 are objected to by the Examiner because of informalities. Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claim 7 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objections to claims 6 and 7 be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 26, 2006

By


Rebecca G. Rudich

Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant